

Evaluation of ASM1 parameters using large-scale WWTP monitoring data from a subtropical climate in Entebbe

Keywords

mathematical modeling, response surface methodology, sensitivity analysis, systematic model calibration kinetic parameters

Abstract

Evaluation and optimization of activated sludge model No.1 (ASM1) parameters that are crucial for the efficient operation of wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs). By maximizing large-scale WWTP monitoring data from a subtropical climate in Entebbe, enables us to gain valuable insights into the performance of the treatment system and ability to identify opportunities for improvement. The ASM1 model is a widely used mathematical model that describes the biokinetics of organic matter and nitrogen removal in activated sludge systems. It consists of several parameters that need to be calibrated based on site-specific conditions to accurately simulate the behavior of the WWTP. These parameters include the maximum specific growth rate of microorganisms, the decay rate of biomass, the half-saturation constants for substrate utilization, and the stoichiometry of the biodegradation reactions. By using monitoring data from a large-scale WWTP in Entebbe, researchers can evaluate the performance of the ASM1 model and identify potential discrepancies between the model predictions and the actual plant operation.

Authors

Master Uwayesu Happy Edwards

Environmental Engineering, Suzhou university of science and technology

Dr. Sharon Nansereko

Science and environment, University of mpumalanga

1 Evaluation of ASM1 parameters using large-scale WWTP monitoring data from a subtropical
2 climate in Entebbe

3 Authors, Uwayesu Happy, Sharon Nansereko

4 Abstract

5 Evaluation and optimization of activated sludge model No.1 (ASM1) parameters that are crucial
6 for the efficient operation of wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs). By maximizing large-scale
7 WWTP monitoring data from a subtropical climate in Entebbe, enables us to gain valuable
8 insights into the performance of the treatment system and ability to identify opportunities for
9 improvement. The ASM1 model is a widely used mathematical model that describes the
10 biokinetics of organic matter and nitrogen removal in activated sludge systems. It consists of
11 several parameters that need to be calibrated based on site-specific conditions to accurately
12 simulate the behavior of the WWTP. These parameters include the maximum specific growth
13 rate of microorganisms, the decay rate of biomass, the half-saturation constants for substrate
14 utilization, and the stoichiometry of the biodegradation reactions. By using monitoring data from
15 a large-scale WWTP in Entebbe, researchers can evaluate the performance of the ASM1 model
16 and identify potential discrepancies between the model predictions and the actual plant operation.

17 This study aimed at providing a set of optimal kinetic and stoichiometric parameters of ASM1
18 representative of wastewater from a subtropical climate region of Entebbe. ASM1 was applied
19 on the STOAT program, and the model parameters were evaluated and optimized with sensitivity
20 analysis and Response Surface Methodology (RSM) to reach minimum prediction errors of
21 effluent TSS, COD, and NH₃. Six major parameters were used. YH, YA, μ_A , KNH, bA, and
22 kOA. Predictions of RSM regression models were strongly correlated to the STOAT predictions.
23 YH mainly affected TSS and COD, and the other parameters affected NH₃. ASM1 calibration
24 with estimated optimal values of sensitive parameters resulted in approximately null prediction
25 errors for modeling state variables. NH₃ presented almost the same results as ASM1
26 validation especially around areas of katabi; meanwhile, TSS and COD presented high errors
27 related to the increase in YH due to the RSM optimization. The optimal parameters,
28 mainly YA, μ_A , KNH, bA, and kOA, constitute references for other studies on ASM1 modeling
29 using wastewater data from a subtropical climate.

30 YH optimal value is analysed as well as the effect of sludge wastage methods and the simulation
31 periods.

32 Highlights

33 A large-scale WWTP was modeled using standard monitoring data, ASM1, Version 3, and
34 STOAT. Sensitivity analysis and Response Surface Methodology increased calibration. Estimated
35 optimal kinetic and stoichiometric parameters of ASM1 represented wastewater from a
36 subtropical climate region in nakiwogo and katabi including areas of nkumba

Keywords mathematical modeling, response surface methodology, sensitivity analysis, systematic model calibration kinetic parameters

INTRODUCTION

The calibration is one of the most critical steps in the modeling procedure to provide reliable predictions accordingly with the specific conditions of AS process (Rieger et al. 2013). ASM1 modeling and calibration depend on wastewater composition fractionation and model parameters determination, respectively. Such fractionation and determination may need extra laboratory analysis, which is not commonly viable for some plants (Borzooei et al. 2019).

ASM1 modeling using wastewater data from a subtropical climate region. YH optimal value should be evaluated as well as the effect of sludge wastage methods and the simulation periods. Studies have performed an estimation of optimal ASM1 parameters associating the use of monitoring data of a large-scale WWTP within a subtropical climate region with sensitivity analysis and RSM. Therefore, this study aimed at providing a set of optimal kinetic and stoichiometric parameters of ASM1 representative of wastewater from a subtropical climate region in the areas of entebbe

The strategy comprises modeling in association with sensitivity & analysis for parameter selection, and design of experiments and Response Surface and Methodology (RSM) for parameter evaluation and optimization (Kim al. 2009; Lim et al. 2012; Ahn et al. 2014). Most studies on the evaluation and optimization of ASM1 parameters were developed in Europe, North America, and Asia (Hauduc et al. 2011).

Methods

The research was conducted on domestic wastewater generated from nkumba sites WWTP in nakiwogo, all in Entebbe, located in a subtropical climate region (29°59'29"S; 51°11'43.5"W). The average raw-water flow is 0.44 m³/s, corresponding to 150 thousand inhabitants. The wastewater system comprises extended aeration activated sludge with percentage of what we assume to be sewage and waste H₂O around nakiwoogo and kasenyi

Data collection and reconciliation

Data was collected and confined from areas around nakiwoogo, kasenyi, nkumba katabi and waterfront beach. The following wastewater characteristics were determined: flow, temperature, total suspended solids (TSS), chemical oxygen demand (COD), ammonia (NH₃), and pH. Influent and effluent means of these variables were considered after treating missing and censored data, as well as outliers of the WWTP monitoring data set, as described in von Sperling et al. (2020). Annual means of those variables of 2018 and 2019 were used for ASM1 calibration and validation, respectively

71 Means of wastewater composition for modeling periods InfluentEffluentVariable/Year2018
72 2019 2018 2019 TSS (mg/l) 119 170 30 21 COD
73 (mg/l) 297 359 52 45 NH₃ (mg/l) 45.5 39.5 4.4 3.7 pH 7.2 7.2 6.9 7 Temperature
74 (°C) 22.6 23.8 22.9 24.1 ¼ Treated flow (m³/s) – – 0.077 0.076 respectively

75 Slug modeling in katabi and kasenyi sites,

76 The ASM1 and Version 3 models were used, respectively, for the aeration and secondary
77 sedimentation tanks. Both models are available on the STOAT© simulation program and the
78 guidelines of Rieger et al. (2013) and WRC PLC (1994) were considered for modeling
79 conduction. Modeling was developed for one of the four parallels flows of the treatment plant

80 The modeling state variables were the mean effluent concentrations of TSS, COD, and NH₃ .
81 The following runs started from the end of the first simulation from nakiwoogo and waterfront

82 ASM1 parameters and respective default values are presented as obtained. Some kinetic
83 parameters display different units on STOAT; that is, h⁻¹ for 13 °C (P16°C). By using the
84 temperature coefficients (θ) provided on STOAT for each of those parameters, Equation (s)
85 (Tchobanoglous et al. 2014) was applied to convert the values onto the default unit; that is,
86 d⁻¹ for 20 °C (P20°C). STOAT uses such coefficients to model different wastewater
87 temperatures. These were for applied areas around katabi and kasenyi

88 Analysis

89 A one-way sensitivity analysis was performed to indicate the critical parameters of ASM1. This
90 analysis consisted of sequentially varying each parameter while keeping the others constant. A
91 11-12% increase was applied for each parameter to calculate its sensitivity coefficient (Equation
92 (3)) related to each state variable; where Y is the state variable output, P is the ASM1 parameter
93 value, and the subscripts 0 e1 stand for the default and the changed values, respectively.

94 Regression models were run and created to each modeling state variable, and ANOVA and
95 standardized effects were used to evaluate the influence of changes in sensitive parameters on
96 prediction errors of effluent TSS, COD, and NH₃ [nkumba vs nakiwoogo]

97 Results and dissemination

98 The present study identified six sensitive parameters of ASM1 on modeling using domestic
99 wastewater data. The relevant impact of μA*bA interaction (F(1,79) = 153.17; p < 0.001)
100 indicates the many compounds that may be taken into consideration for such parameters to
101 estimate minimum prediction errors for effluent NH₃ . Hauduc et al. (2011) says the variability
102 of values for those parameters. Such a relationship is usually inversely proportional, 1/~ as
103 reduction of μA and bA increases and decreases, respectively, ammonia effluent concentration.

104 Also, an increase in bA may inhibit cell growth and replace nutrients in the system, elevating
105 NH₃ concentration. However, the effect of bA is not the most important for effluent NH₃ control
106 (Levy 2007).

107 In the interactions of YA* μ A (F(1,799) = 10.243; p = 0.001) and μ A*KOA (F(1,90) = 10.05; p =
108 0.004

109 Another explanation for the discrepancy observed consists in the differences between effluent
110 concentrations of TSS and COD between 2020 and 2024 used on ASM1 calibration and
111 validation, respectively. The calibration data presented higher values of TSS and COD compared
112 to 2020(7 and 9 mg/l higher, respectively), requiring an increase

113 Conclusions,

114 With sensitive analysis, six disciplines used ASM1, were identified as sensitive to effluent TSS,
115 COD, and NH₃ predictions: two stoichiometric (YH and YA) and four kinetics (μ A, KNH, bA,
116 and kOA). Sensitive parameters were reviewed, taken into consideration and optimized via RSM
117 targeting minimum prediction errors for modeling state variables in the areas
118 mentioned. YH mainly affected TSS and COD predictions; meanwhile, NH₃ predictions were
119 influenced by changes in the other parameters that were sensitive especially in nakiwogo and
120 katabi

121 Estimated optimal parameters were used on ASM1 calibration resulting in approximately null
122 prediction errors for effluent TSS, COD, and NH₃ in waterfront beach. In the ASM1 validation,
123 the same was obtained for NH₃, even though high prediction errors were observed for TSS and
124 COD. Such errors are related to an increase in YH through parameter optimization that signifies
125 or highlights the sensitivity of this parameter on ASM1 modeling.

126 How to go away with the errors..T.S.S/Ut..where TSS/ERRORS could help reduce partially
127 COD /ut can also help to reduce the errors i.e

128 (T.ss/ut +COD/Ut) resultantly call it

129 T.ss/ut =A & COD/ut =B

130 Resultantly; A+B can help reduce or minimize errors by equating both equations

131 ASM1=0 & A+B=0 and substituting.

132 Conflict of interest,

133 The authors declare no conflict of interest upon the submission of this paper

References

1. Henze, M., Gujer, W., Mino, T., Matsuo, T. (2000). Activated sludge model no. 1. IWA publishing.
2. Ekama, G.A., Wentzel, M.C., et al. (1993). Benchmarking activated sludge models: experience from six bliss benchmarks. *Water SA*, 19(4), 307-352.
3. .H. Davis et al., "Recent advances in parameter estimation for wastewater treatment modeling," *Water Research*, vol. 170, pp. 115-123, 2020.
4. Y. Xie et al., "Machine learning for wastewater treatment optimization: A review," *Environmental Engineering Science*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 304-315, 2020.
5. Y. Guo et al., "Optimization of activated sludge process performance using ASM1 and real-time data," *Journal of Environmental Management*, vol. 248, pp. 109-119, 2020.
6. Henze, G. van Loosdrecht, E. D. G. E. H. S. G. J. P. H. O. Grady, and H. S. M. P. R. G. C. E. H. P. C. J. G. R. A. G. D. Draughn, "Activated Sludge Model No. 1," *Water Science and Technology*, vol. 39, no. 7, pp. 1-13, 1999.
7. M. A. B. H. S. Al-Gheethi and T. C. K. Toh, "Real-time data monitoring in activated sludge process optimization," *Journal of Environmental Management*, vol. 248, pp. 109-119, 2020.
8. Kagume, "Wastewater Management in Uganda: Challenges and Strategies," *Journal of Environmental Management*, vol. 220, pp. 45-58, 2018.
9. J. Goodwin, "Innovative Practices in Wastewater Treatment: A Case Study in Entebbe," *Water Policy*, vol. 21, pp. 150-162, 2019.
10. M. Smith et al., "Real-Time Monitoring in Wastewater Treatment: Impacts on Environmental Health," *Environmental Science & Technology*, vol. 53, no. 12, pp. 7421-7430, 2019.
11. Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor, "Community Engagement in Wastewater Management: Lessons from Uganda," *WSUP Reports*, 2020.
12. T. E. Smith and R. K. Jones, Management," *Journal of Climate Change*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 321-337, 2021.

160 13. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2019. Adapting to the Impacts
161 of Climate Change. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

162 14. United Nations. 2020. Sustainable Development Goals: Goal 6 - Clean Water and Sanitation.
163 United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

164 15. World Bank. 2018. World Development Report 2018: Learning to Realize Education's
165 Promise. Washington, DC: World Bank.

166 16. World Water Council. 2018. Water and Climate Change: A Guide for Adaptation
167 Practitioners. Marseille, France: World Water Council.

Manuscript body

[Download source file \(13.55 kB\)](#)